Strrred Question No. 294—(*Continued*)

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—I am sorry I made a mistake in replying to Question No. 294. This question refers to 1957 Exhibition. My replies were about the Sadashivnagar Exhibition held in 1962, in which I was in charge of the finances. And that question referred to the open Session. There I know all these were disposed of to the Apex Bank. About 1957 Exhibition, I am aware of nothing. I now learn that the then Chief Minister had assured that the necessary information would be obtained. I will also make necessary attempts. I will write to the Congress President and see if any records are available. I am sorry that mistake was made.

1-30 PM.

Sri K. MALLAPPA.—Once before this question came up and an assurance was given to hold over the question so that information could be collected. I tried my best and I was not able to get the information. Zinc sheets have been sold out in due course. But no information is available. I have made it clear that no complaints have been received by the Government as to the sale of these zinc sheets in the black market.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—On a point of order, Sir. While replying to the question, his answer was that he would supply the information later, and the Hon'ble Speaker promised that the question may be held over. The next question was taken up. Is the Hon'ble Chief Minister now entitled to get that information and intervene in this way? He has made a submission to this House. It is a point of procedure I point out. The Procedure adopted by the Hon'ble Chief Minister is rather very strange and it is not contemplated under the rules of Procedure. Therefore, I make a submission to the Speaker whether it is a justifiable procedure?

Mr. SPEAKER.—This Hon'ble Member requires has to study, and is directed to study more before he raises points of orders of this type. Which rule is violated? Will he kindly tell me? Does he know what a point of order is? Which rule or convention is violated? He is simply and unnecessarily engaging the House. I am really sorry.

Sri K. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—When the Speaker says that the question is held over, that is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—After I have given a ruling, if there is any new point of order, it can be raised. If the Hon'ble Member wanted to reinforce, he should have attracted my attention. I was asking Sri Lakkappa to tell me which rule governing the conduct of business is violated, which convention is violated and what ruling he has got in support of what he said? I can reject the point of order only on that ground saying that the point of order raised, is without any substance, and the Member is unable to substantiate. But I will deal with it.

(MR. SPEAKER)

What is it that the Hon'ble Chief Minister has done ? He found out that he had committed a mistake and the earliest opportunity had to be availed of in correcting a mistake. If the Hon'ble Chief Minister did not find there was a mistake committed, he would not have stood up at all. He realised and he did not want the House or anybody to be under any misapprehension. The Hon'ble Member Sri Lakkappa thinks that the mistake should have been allowed and it should not have been corrected. There is nothing wrong in correcting the mistake. On the other hand, there is everything that is right. There is no point of order.

SRI K. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—We are thankful to the Chief Minister.....

MR. SPEAKER.—Is that a point of order ?

SRI K. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Yes, Sir. If there is no revision of the ruling of the Speaker, then the Speaker's ruling stands. When the Hon'ble Member Sri G. V. Gowda wanted to put one little supplementary, following Sri Channabyre Gowda, the Hon'ble Speaker said that since the question had been with-held no further questions would be permitted. Therefore we took it that the matter was closed. We do not know how the matter was raised. We thought that the Hon'ble Speaker must have revised his opinion, and we must also be given an opportunity to put a supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member either has not understood or has deliberately turned his mind to a wrong corner. Where have I revised my ruling ? Have I said that the question should be taken ?

SRI K. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—We concede the poor intelligence, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER.—He can keep it to himself. But if he flings it at me and says that I have revised my ruling and says that I have permitted something, it implies a very serious charge against, me which I am not prepared to go unnoticed.

SRI K. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—There was no intention to insinuate the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER.—I have not changed that ruling. All that has happened is, the Chief Minister has given a personal explanation arising out of a mistake. Does it amount to a revision of my ruling ?

SRI K. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Because Sri Revana Siddappa was called upon to speak, though the question was re-opened. Perhaps I made a mistake.

SRI V. S. PATIL.—The only thing is, it has created this sort of atmosphere..... .....

MR. SPEAKER.—The atmosphere is perfectly clear.

SRI V. S. PATIL.—Once the Ruling was given that the question is held over, supplementaries stopped automatically. There was no question. But when the Hon'ble Chief Minister raised and gave some explanation, we were under the impression, because some explanation

was given by the Hon'ble Minister concerned,—we were under the impression that the matter is finished. That is why we wanted to get an assurance from you that the matter is not finished. It is still pending and the question is held over.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the matter ends. All this did not matter very much, because there is ample time and the questions are almost exhausted. I have not revised my ruling. It has gone into records. The question is going to be taken up again. Whatever is said is said by way of personal explanation. Personal explanation has to be given at the earliest opportunity. It is not a revision of the ruling.

Industrial Estates.

*Q.—122 Smt. B. L. SUBBAMMA (Chickmagalur).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) the number of Industrial Estates included in the First, Second and Third Five-Year Plans (Planwise figures may be furnished) ;

(*b*) out of which the number completed, the number left incomplete and the number not stared ;

(*c*) whether it is a fact that some estates have been closed for want of raw materials ;

(*d*) if so, the number of such estates ?

A.—Sri K. MALLAPPA (Minister for Industries and Commerce).—

(*a*) The programme of Industrial Estates was not included in the Mysore State's First Five-Year Plan. The number of Estates included under the Second and Third Five-Year Plans were 8 and 30, repectively.

(*b*) All the 8 (eight) Industrial Estates included under the Second Five-Year Plan have been completed. Out of the 30 Industrial Estates included under the Third Five-Year Plan, 4 have been completed, 6 are under construction and 20 have not been started.

(*c*) No.

(*d*) Does not arise.

ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಬಿ. ಎಲ್. ಸುಬ್ಬಮ್ಮ.—ಕ್ಯಾಮಿ, 2ನೇ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದ 8 ಕೈಗಾರಿಕಾ ವಸಾಹತುಗಳೆಲ್ಲ ಪೂ ನಹ ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿವೆ. 3ನೇ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದ 30 ಹೊಸ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕಾ ವಸಾಹತುಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ 4 ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿವೆ, 6ರ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಕಾರ್ಯ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇನ್ನು ಉಳಿದ 20 ವಸಾಹತುಗಳನ್ನು 3ನೇ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಯ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂರೈಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ?

† ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ.—ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಬಿ. ಎಲ್. ಸುಬ್ಬಮ್ಮ.—ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಅವನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿನ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ! ಅಥವಾ ಅವುಗಳ ಮುಂದಿನ ಭವಿಷ್ಯ ಏನು !